



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/007,063	11/08/2001	Prabhakar Gopalan	AUS920010770US1	6213
7590	02/28/2005		EXAMINER	
Frank C. Nicholas CARDINAL LAW GROUP Suite 2000 1603 Orrington Avenue Evanston, IL 60201			HONEYCUTT, KRISTINA B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	
			DATE MAILED: 02/28/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/007,063	GOPALAN, PRABHAKAR	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kristina B. Honeycutt	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 08 November 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date .

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on December 13, 2004.

This action is made Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 22-25 have been added. Claims 1-25 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 11, 21 and 22 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. The rejection of claims 1, 11 and 21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as lacking antecedent basis, has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

4. The rejection of claim 20 ejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as lacking antecedent basis, has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

5. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. Claim 22 recites the limitation "the Web browser" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 11-13, 15-18 and 20-21 remain and claims 22 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mantha et al. (U.S. Patent 6163779) in view of Burman et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20010010059).

Regarding independent claim 1, Mantha discloses receiving a selection of a portion of the Web page (col. 8, lines 40-42) and storing the selected portion of the Web page to the client local storage (col. 2, lines 24-26; col. 12, lines 7-11).

Mantha does not disclose determining the date information from a Web browser or linking the date information to the stored portion of the Web page.

Burman teaches determining date information from a Web browser (p.8, para. 80) and linking the date information to the Web page (p.8, para. 80) since Burman discloses determining date information for transferring a Web page and it is obvious that the date information is linked to that particular Web page. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Mantha and Burman before him at the time the invention was made, to modify storing a Web page as taught by Mantha to include determining and linking date information to the Web page as taught by Burman, because associating date information with the Web page would allow the user to determine if the stored portion of the Web page was the most up-to-date version available. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because the user would be able to easily determine if the stored version was current with the version available through the Internet by quickly looking at the linked date information and comparing it with the date information for the online version.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Mantha discloses the portion of the Web page is selected from a group consisting of text data, image data, and site link data (col. 1, lines 12-20).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Mantha discloses storing the selected portion of the Web page comprises saving the selected portion to a main HTML file (col. 2, lines 24-26).

Regarding dependent claim 5, Mantha discloses the selected portion of the Web page includes image data that is stored in a separate file (col. 9, lines 52-62).

Regarding dependent claim 6, Mantha discloses linking a main HTML file to the separate image data file (col. 10, lines 11-15).

Regarding dependent claim 7, Mantha discloses the selected portion includes site link data that is stored in a separate file (col. 10, lines 22-25; col. 11, lines 8-10).

Regarding dependent claim 8, Mantha discloses linking a main HTML file to the separate site link data file (col. 12, lines 22-32).

Regarding claims 11-13, 15-18 and 21, the claims reflect a computer usable medium storing a program for performing and a system for performing the methods of claims 1-3 and 5-8 and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 20, Mantha discloses a link to the main HTML file from the “icon” (col. 12, lines 7-13).

Regarding independent claim 22, Mantha discloses receiving a first click of an icon to select a portion of a web page (col. 8, lines 28-42; Figure 5A).

Mantha further discloses receiving the selected portion of the web page (col. 8, lines 40-42).

Mantha further discloses receiving a second click of the icon to copy the selected portion (col. 8, lines 42-49; col. 12, lines 7-11; Figure 5A).

Mantha discloses storing the selected portion to a client local storage (col. 8, lines 42-49; col. 12, lines 7-11) but does not disclose determining date information from the Web browser or storing the date information to a client local storage. Burman teaches determining date information from a Web browser (p.8, para. 80) and storing the date information in local storage (p.8, para. 80). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Mantha and Burman before him at the time the invention was made, to modify storing a Web page as taught by Mantha to include determining and storing date information as taught by Burman, because Mantha teaches transmitting a web page from a server and storing the web page locally (col. 1, lines 12-28; col. 8, lines 42-49; col. 12, lines 7-11) and Burman teaches determining date information during transmission and storing the date information locally (p.8, para. 80). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because the date information would be stored locally as would the selected web page and when the web page is transmitted, the date information would be determined which would provide the user with a reference to the most recently saved transmission.

Regarding dependent claim 24, Mantha discloses receiving a second click of the icon to copy the selected portion comprises copying text data into a main HTML file (col. 2, lines 24-26).

Regarding dependent claim 25, Mantha discloses storing the selected portion in a main HTML file (col. 2, lines 24-26) but does not disclose storing the date information with the selected portion. Burman teaches storing the date information in local storage on a user's computer (p.8, para. 80). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Mantha and Burman before him at the time the invention was made, to modify storing a selected portion as taught by Mantha to include storing date information as taught by Burman, because Mantha teaches storing the selected portion in the main HTML file on the local hard drive (col. 2, lines 24-26) and Burman teaches storing the date information on the user's computer (p.8, para. 80). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because the date information would be stored locally with the selected portion when the web page is transmitted and the date information is determined upon transmission, which would provide the user with the date of the most recently saved transmission.

8. Claims 4 and 14 remain and claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mantha et al. (U.S. Patent 6163779) in view of

Burman et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20010010059) in further view of Krause et al. (U.S. Patent 6266684).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Mantha does not disclose storing a second selected portion to a main HTML file. Krause teaches storing a second selected portion to an HTML file (col. 7, lines 6-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Mantha and Krause before him at the time the invention was made, to modify storing a portion of a Web page to an HTML file as taught by Mantha to include storing a second selected portion as taught by Krause, because storing one portion of a Web page to a main file and then storing another would allow the user to easily select and store portions of the Web page that are not conjoined in the page. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because the user would be able to store a portion near the top of the Web page and then store a portion near the bottom of the Web page without storing the information between the portions and still have the selected portions stored in the same file.

Regarding dependent claim 14, the claim reflects a computer usable medium storing a program for performing the method of claim 4 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 23, Mantha does not disclose receiving a highlighted portion of the web page. Krause teaches receiving a highlighted

portion (col. 7, lines 11-14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Mantha and Krause before him at the time the invention was made, to modify receiving a selected portion of a web page as taught by Mantha to include receiving a highlighted portion of the web page as taught by Krause, because Mantha teaches an input device for selecting items (col. 5, lines 20-23) and Krause teaches using an input device for highlighting (col. 6, lines 5-6). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because Krause teaches selecting a portion with the input device (col. 5, lines 20-23) and highlighting a portion is a means of selecting.

9. Claims 9, 10 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mantha et al. (U.S. Patent 6163779) in view of Burman et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20010010059) in further view of Chi (U.S. Pub. No. 20040199466).

Regarding dependent claim 9, Mantha does not disclose installing an icon on a Web browser. Chi teaches installing an icon on a Web browser (p.3, para. 41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Mantha and Chi before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the method taught by Mantha to include installing an icon on a Web browser as taught by Chi, because the icon would remain active without regard to the web sites the user is visiting, as taught by Chi (p.3, para. 41). It would

have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because the user would be able to easily store portions of Web pages from the browser while visiting any web site by using the icon.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Mantha discloses a link to the main HTML file from the "icon" (col. 12, lines 7-13).

Regarding dependent claim 19, the claim reflects a computer usable medium storing a program for performing the method of claim 9 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed December 13, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding claim 1, Applicants indicate that Mantha in view of Burman does not teach or suggest linking the date information to the stored portion of the web page (B., lines 7-8). The Examiner disagrees because Mantha in view of Burman teaches linking date information to the stored portion of the web page. In other words, Mantha teaches transmitting a portion of a web page from a server (col. 1, lines 12-28) and storing the portion locally (col. 8, lines 42-49; col. 12, lines 7-11) and Burman teaches determining date information during transmission and storing the date information locally (p.8, para. 80). Since Mantha teaches transmitting a web page and Burman teaches

determining date information upon transmission of a web page and both teaches storing the information on local storage, the date information is linked to the stored portion of the web page.

Claims 2-3 and 5-8 depend from independent claim 1. Therefore claims 2-3 and 5-8 are rejected at least based on the rationale of the rejection above.

Claims 11 and 21 reflect a computer usable medium and a system for performing the methods of claim 1 and is rejected based on the rationale of the rejection above.

Claims 12-13, 15-18 and 20 depend from independent claim 11. Therefore claims 12-13, 15-18 and 20 are rejected at least based on the rationale of the rejection above.

Claims 4 and 14 depend from independent claims 1 and 11. Therefore claims 4 and 14 are rejected at least based on the rationale of the rejection above.

Claims 9-10 and 19 depend from independent claims 1 and 11. Therefore claims 9-10 and 19 are rejected at least based on the rationale of the rejection above.

Regarding independent claim 22, Applicants indicate that the prior art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every claimed element (E., lines 2-3). The Examiner disagrees because Mantha discloses receiving a first click of an icon to select a portion of a web page (col. 8, lines 28-42; Figure 5A), receiving the selected portion of the web page (col. 8, lines 40-42), receiving a second click of the icon to copy the selected portion (col. 8, lines 42-49; col. 12, lines 7-11; Figure 5A) and storing the selected portion to a client local storage (col. 8, lines 42-49; col. 12, lines 7-11) and Burman teaches determining date information from a Web browser (p.8, para. 80) and storing the date information in local storage (p.8, para. 80).

Claims 23-25 depend from independent claim 22. Therefore claims 23-25 are rejected at least based on the rationale of the rejection above.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory

action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- System, method and computer program product for transcoding form content for display on this client devices (U.S. Pub. No. 20020038351),
- Apparatus and method for designating information to be retrieved over a computer network (U.S. Patent 6278449).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristina B. Honeycutt whose telephone number is 571-272-4123. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:00 Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 703-308-5465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-272-4124.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KBH

Cesar A. Park
CESAR A. PARK
PRIMARY EXAMINER
AU 2178